DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 828 JC 030 407

AUTHOR	Hopkins, Ruth A.; Prins, Esther
TITLE	Catalyst: Inquiry for Change, 2001.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell Univ.
REPORT NO	Vol-1
PUB DATE	2001-03-00
NOTE	24p.; Prepared by The Institute for Community College Development (ICCD), a partnership between Cornell University and the State University of New York. Document includes Volume 1, Numbers 1-4 of Catalyst research briefs.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text of each research brief: http://www.iccd.cornell.edu/DisplayAPage.cfm?MenuID=121.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Community Needs; Community Role; *Competency Based Education; Consortia; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Finance; Institutional Mission; *Mentors; School Community Programs; *Service Learning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Cornell University NY

ABSTRACT

This document contains a series of 2001 research briefs, Catalyst: Inquiry for Change (Volume 1), that is part of a research project supported by the Institute for Community College Development at Cornell University, New York. The Institute's research projects are stakeholder driven for the purpose of researching areas of the most interest to community colleges and their peer institutions in terms of social, economic, and policy considerations for bringing about change. The Catalyst offers Institute research project summaries. The Catalyst will be disseminated to community college presidents, senior administrators in institutional research, student development, business, academic affairs, and faculty. The first in the series of research briefs produced in 2001 (Volume 1, Number 1) is titled: "Performance Based Funding: What Indicators Do U.S. Community College Systems Use?" (Ruth A. Hopkins). The second brief in the series (Volume 1, Number 2) is titled: "The Relationship Between Institutional Mission, Service, and Service-Learning at Community Colleges in New York State" (Esther Prins). The next brief (Volume 1, Number 3) is titled: "Decision-Making for Partnership Engagement by SUNY Community College Presidents" (Esther Prins). The last brief in the series (Volume 1, Number 4) is titled "Connecting the Classroom to the Community: Community College Professors' Experiences in Service Learning" (Esther Prins). (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 828

Catalyst: Inquiry for Change, 2001

Ruth A. Hopkins
Esther Prins

Volume 1 Numbers 1-4
Institute for Community College Development

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- [] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Viniar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

JC 030 407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Catalyst: INQUIRY FOR CHANGE

vol.1 no.1 ■ March 2001

PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING: *WHAT INDICATORS DO U.S. COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEMS USE?*

A report provided by the Institute for Community College Development
Prepared by Ruth A. Hopkins, Graduate Research Assistant

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Findings

- **A. Performance based funding indicators contrasted with performance based budgeting indicators**
- **B. Indicators used**
- **C. Relationship of state funding patterns to types of indicators used**
- **D. Type indicators used with local funding levels similar to NYS or with large state budgets**
- **E. Total number of indicators used by states**

III. Discussion

- **A. About the chosen indicators**
- **B. Some highlights**
- **C. Linkage between indicators and NYS Community College mission**

IV. Summary

I. Introduction

The State University of New York Community College System is faced with the challenge of deciding in what ways it will develop and implement performance indicators and performance based funding. Wide based discussion among all groups of stakeholders is ongoing. Legislators and community college leaders are talking with their constituencies about desired outcomes of community college efforts. Community college leaders are examining their missions and strategic plans to determine how they can be used to develop meaningful outcome measures. All concerned are looking at the experience of other academic systems that have embarked on the task of implementing performance based funding indicators.

The purpose of this study was to provide information about performance-based indicators being used by community college systems in other states. Because of the close relationship between actual indicators and the interests of those who provide the funding for the community colleges it was important to relate indicators to the funding patterns in use in each state.

The intent of this report is to provide information to those who will partici-

The Institute for Community College Development at Cornell is committed to providing high quality and timely research to community colleges. Research projects are stakeholder driven for the purpose of researching areas of the most interest to community colleges and their peer institutions in terms of social, economic, and policy considerations for bringing about change. The *Catalyst* is the very first publication of research projects conducted by the Institute to fulfill its research objectives. As the Institute's research program grows, the *Catalyst* will be disseminated to community college presidents, senior administrators in institutional research, student development, business, academic affairs, and faculty. Project summaries can also be accessed on ICCD's website: http//www.iccd.cornell.edu

This research project was supported by the Institute for Community College Development at Cornell under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Grigoriu, Cornell University.

IC030407

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

pate in the deliberations and implementation of performance based funding. In addition to the summaries of current state uses, some additional background is included as perspective for those who have not studied the issue.

II. Findings

A. Performance based *funding* indicators contrasted with performance based *budgeting* indicators

The use of performance indicators in the 'budgeting' or 'reporting processes may have different outcomes than the use of performance indicators in the 'funding' process. The budgeting and funding processes vary among states. Dollars agreed upon in the budget planning or budget appropriation stages are not necessarily the same as final levels of funding. It is the intent of this report to target those states using performance indicators that affect actual funding. However, because of the variations across states, some of the performance indicators may in practice be used for reporting or budgeting phases of the funding process while other algorithms are used for the actual transmittal of final funding levels.

B. Indicators used

(See Tables 1 and 2.)

Category	(Code)	Indicators
Satisfaction	(S)	of students or alumni satisfaction
Educational Achievement	(EA)	degrees, certificates, persistence, time/credits to degree, and other
Pursuit of Additional Education	(PAE)	transfer rates, numbers
Meeting Workforce Goals	(MWG)	job placements, job retention, wages
Community Response	(CR)	business & community partners, linkages with K-12, access
Serving Special Needs	(SSN-EA)	basic skills, remediation success, service to disadvantaged
Efficiency	(E)	faculty productivity, class size technology implementation

Table 1. Indicators currently in use by category of indicator

Indicator	(Code)	Frequency
Transfer Rate	(PAE)	13
Graduate/Degree/Certificates	(EA)	12
Job Placements/Job Retention/Wages	(MWG)	12
Basic Skills/Remediation Success	(EA)	12
Course Completion/Freshman Persistence	(EA)	11
Pass Rates	(EA)	8
Instructional Productivity	(E)	6
Efficiency & Productivity	(E)	6
Service to Disadvantaged	(SSN)	4
Community Response/Business Partners	(CR)	4
Time to Degree	(EA)	2
Alumni Satisfaction	(S)	3
Student Satisfaction	(S)	3
Meetings Access Needs	(CR)	3
Lower Division Class Size	(E)	2
Technology Implementation	(E)	2
Credits to Degree	(EA)	1
Linkages with K-12	(CR)	1

Table 2. Performance Indicators For Community Colleges: Frequency of Use Across States (n=44)*

*Data Sources:
Eduction Commission of the States: Community College Finance Policy Survey: Preliminary Findings, 2/28/00
Center for Higher Education & Educational Finance, Grapevine, 2/25/00
State Higher Education Executive Officers, The Transition From Business as Usual to Funding for Results, April 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Relationship of state funding patterns to type of indicator used

The intent of this survey was to examine whether indicators varied among states systems with varying proportions of funding from local governments. Hence, we assembled information for each state system about the proportion of funding from each major funding source. Table 3 displays these funding patterns. Six states were identified as most similar to New York state's 31% local funding. These six were examined separately from the other states and deserve particular attention because they may be incorporating both local and state interests in the choice of indicators.

Seven states with large state budgets, above 1.0 billion, have been highlighted. These states are of interest because they are large systems, as is New York state, and may have similar concerns among the legislators who ultimately select the indicators.

Table 3. State funding patterns. Percentage of funding provided by state and local government for states using indicators. New York is listed for comparison.

State		State Budget	%State Funds	%Local Funds
New York		3.1	29	31
Illinois		2.5	26	43
Maryland		1.0	23	36
California	Avg.	7.7	54	35
New Jersey	32.6%	1.5	24	30
Missouri		1.0	42	26
Oregon		0.7	53	26
Washington		1.2	59	19
Texas	Avg.	4.0	38	18
Ohio	16%	2.1	47	14
N. Carolina		2.3	75	13
Virginia	Avg.	1.5	58	0.4
Florida	0%	2.8	69	0.2
Indiana		1.2	62	0

Table 4: Indicators for states with local funding similar to NYS

Indicator	#Using Indicator (n=7)
Basic Skills & Remediation Success	5
Transfer Rate	4
Degrees & Certificates	4
Course Completion Rates & Freshman Persistence	4
Job Placement/Job Retention/Wages	4
Student Satisfaction	3
Pass Rates	3
Community & Business Partners	3
Access	2
Service to Disadvantaged	2
Alumni Satisfaction	1
Time to Degree/Credits to Degree	1
Faculty Quality & Instructional Productivity	1
Technology Implementation	1

Table 5: Indicators for States with large budgets but little local funding

Indicator	#Using Indicator (n=7)
Transfer Rate	6
Basic Skills & Remediation Success	5
Degrees & Certificates	5
Job Placements/Job Retention/Wages	5
Course Completion & Freshman Persistence	4
Faculty Quality & Instructional Productivity	3
Pass Rates	2
Service to Disadvantaged	2
Community & Business Partners	1
Linkages with K-12	1
Meeting Access Needs	1
Efficiency & Productivity	1

D. Type indicators used in states with local funding levels similar to NYS or with large state budgets

Six states with local funding greater than 20% were Illinois, Maryland, California, New Jersey, Missouri and Oregon. The indicators used by those states are shown in Table 4. Indicators for the seven states with budgets greater than $1 billion but with a much smaller proportion of local funding are shown below in Table 5.

As can be seen by comparing Tables 4 and 5, there do not appear to be differences in the nature of the indicators selected by those states with local funding greater than 20% and those states with local funding less than 20%.

E. Total number of indicators.

The total number of indicators used by states did not appear to vary with the pattern of state and local funding. The average number of indicators for states with more than 20% local funding is 5.6. (Table 6) The average number of indicators for states with less than 20% local funding is 6.3. (Table 7)

The total number of indicators used appears to be somewhat greater in states with larger state budgets and somewhat less for states with smaller state budgets but again the difference is small and the total range of indicators used is between 4 and 9 if one excludes Indiana. (Tables 8 & 9)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6. Total number of indicators: States with local support greater than 20%

State	#Indicators	State Budget
Illinois	9.0	2.5
Maryland	4.0	1.0
California	7.0	7.7
New Jersey	8.0	1.5
Missouri	6.0	1.0
Oregon	5.0	0.7
Average	**6.5**	

Table 7. Total number of indicators: States with local support less than 20%

State	#Indicators	State Budget
Washington	5.0	1.2
Ohio	7.0	2.1
N. Carolina	6.0	7.7
Virginia	6.0	1.5
Texas	7.0	1.0
Florida	6.0	0.7
Indiana	1.0	1.2
Average	**5.4**	

State	#Indicators	State Budget
California	7	7.7
Texas	7	4.0
Florida	6	2.8
Illinois	9	2.5
N. Carolina	6	2.3
Ohio	7	2.1
Average # indicators	**7**	
New Jersey	8	1.5
Virginia	6	1.5
Washington	5	1.2
Indiana	1	1.2
Maryland	4	1.0
Missouri	6	1.0
Oregon	5	0.7
Average # indicators	**5**	

Table 8. Total indicators used: States with large budgets

State	#Indicators	State Budget
Illinois	9.0	2.5
Maryland	4.0	1.0
California	7.0	7.7
New Jersey	8.0	1.5
Missouri	6.0	1.0
Oregon	5.0	0.7
Average	**6.5**	

Table 9. Total indicators: States with lesser budgets.

continued on page 5

III. Discussion

A. About the chosen indicators

Educational achievement indicators are used more frequently than other indicator categories among states reporting that they are using indicators. Degrees and certificates granted, course completion and freshman persistence, and pass rates on tests are the indicators selected in this category. *Educational achievement* indicators have an advantage over other types of indicators in that many are more controllable by the community college. As an example, some states measure *educational achievement* not on an absolute basis but rather as achievement relative to an expressed goal of the student at the time of matriculation. By using the student's goal, rather than an arbitrary goal, the community college is better able to reflect the result of these efforts.

The indicator measuring *remedial education and meeting the needs of the disadvantaged* is noted separately from other educational achievement indicators because of its unique purpose, namely to identify and give special recognition to a highly valued aspect of the community college contribution.

Indicators recognizing the community college response to community need, namely *job placement, increased wage capabilities, and transfer rates* are the second most common indicator category. These indicators are more difficult for the community college to control because of their dependence on the overall economic climate and educational aspirations of the community and its members. As examples, job *placement* may reflect the current job market just as much as the community college's success in placing the student. Transfer rate may reflect the capabilities, interests and ambitions of the particular group of students admitted rather than the overall ability of the community college to prepare the students for transfer.

Job placement, increased wage capabilities, and transfer rates may be chosen because they represent 'outcome' measures, or in the case of increased wages, 'value added.' They are viewed as the economic measure of the value of the education provided. In other instances they are viewed to measure some broader economic need within a targeted sector.

Some states have chosen indicators to measure the portion of the outcome most closely controlled by the college. For example, instead of job placement, job readiness may be used, instead of wages earned, a measure of earning capacity may be used, and instead of transfer rate, transfer readiness may be reported. These are illustrations of associated measures that more accurately reflect the effort of the community college than the economic climate or the personal career decisions of the students.

States using indicators of *efficiency* have generally selected "instructional productivity" or other output ratios. Efficiency measures have been a common assessment tool for many years and are incorporated in most reporting schemes. States have developed multiple ways to judge relative efficiency through uniform cost studies that support detailed assessments of revenue and expense variances. By comparing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the use of resources states have been able to achieve some assurance of the efficient use of funding. Hence, it is not surprising that this category is selected less frequently than measures of educational achievement or community needs. Most of the newly instituted performance based funding mechanisms are applied as budget "add-ons" with the express purpose of providing outcome incentive. Hence, it would seem unlikely that states will choose to use this mechanism to monitor or improve efficiency.

B. Some highlights

*Illinois uses nine indicators, six chosen by the state and three chosen by the local college. The three locally chosen indicators must focus on targeted areas of *workforce development, technology enhancement of education,* and *responsibility to local community.*

Illinois also has targeted grant programs, one for innovative technology programs and another for leadership and core values programs.

*Florida classifies the indicators they have chosen to use as either "General Transfer" or "Workforce Development." They are monitored by different agencies within the state system. The "General Transfer" programs have three performance indicators: *number of degrees/certificates, special populations served* (black males, etc.), *and number of degrees in less than 72 credit hours.*

The "Workforce Development" programs have a more complex system that weights the indicators in an overall evaluation and feedback system. They include indicators for remediation and non-credit contact hours.

There is evidence that the workforce indicators are having a positive influence on the development of new programs and the abandonment of old programs.

*Washington State recently revised its indicators. After two years of working with indicators that were chosen by the state legislature after only minimal discussion with community colleges, the colleges revolted. Broad-based representative task forces were assembled to revise the plan. There are now three indicators: number of prepared transfers, percent of students in remediation who progress to next level, and number of vocational/technical degrees and certificates

C. Linkage between indicators and NYS community college mission

The purpose of performance based funding is accountability. One way to view accountability is to ask how the community colleges are meeting the mission set forth by the State. This report provides examples of indicators that might be considered as appropriate measure of each portion of the mission statement for New York State community colleges.

Mission *"...in partnership with local government"*
- Include mechanism that allows local government participation in selection of indicators
- Insure that local governments participate in development of performance indicator program

Mission *"...ensure access"*
- Use indicators that reflect enrollments of targeted special need groups

Mission *"...to quality higher education and training"*
- Use indicators that reflect customer satisfaction, students, employers, four year colleges

Mission *"...for N.Y.S. citizens"*
- Use indicator reflecting percent enrollments by N.Y.S

Mission *"...ensure development of highly skilled workforce"*
- Use indicator to reflect match between college programs, concentration of its graduates, and current economic and occupational needs of the state

Mission *"...to serve the community, both by individual colleges and system wide"*
- Use indicators that reflect market penetration in the local community

Mission *"...to provide vast array of general, transfer, vocational and technical education programs"*
- Use indicators that can be linked to productivity and statewide program availability

Mission *"...to support degree and certificate programs"*
- Use indicators reflecting degrees, certificates and course completions in all areas
- Use indicators summarizing contact hours provided on contract basis

Mission *"...to serve populations with special needs"*
- Use indicators that target special groups, e.g., black males, under prepared students, ESL enrollments

Mission "...to stay at forefront of workforce development, remain responsive"
- Use indicators of employer satisfaction, achievements resulting from new partnerships

Mission *"...to offer environment that improves quality of life for persons of diverse backgrounds and aspirations"*
- Use indicators of satisfaction

IV. Summary

Use of performance based indicators in the funding process of community colleges can be linked to factors such as the public's increasing dissatisfaction with rapidly rising costs of higher education, national trends toward increasing customer focus, and a desire for accountability via outcomes not process.

There is a belief that performance indicators and their inclusion in the funding process can increase accountability, focus performance on desired outcomes, be used as catalysts for desired change, and encourage more targeted focus on learning results.

Performance indicators have been used in other states to inform the budgeting process, to allocate actual funding, to award specific grants, and for annual reporting.

Best practices in developing, implementing and using performance-based indicators include:

- Planning that is characterized by broad stakeholder representation and full understanding of interests
- Implementation timeframes that include periodic review and allow for trial and error
- Indicators that focus on both state and local priorities, quality learning, rewarding improvements, allowing institutional control, and looking to the future
- Funding systems that are limited to 1-5% of the budget that involves new money, and do not duplicate existing data collection

Performance indicators have been used by other states to help them achieve their mission; likewise mission statements have become the basis for selection of indicators.

Successful implementation of performance indicators appears to be linked to an open and careful process that involves all stakeholders and captures the interests of those stakeholders.

iccd
Institute for Community College Development
A SUNY and Cornell University Partnership

Department of Education
Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4203
www.iccd.cornell.edu

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY-CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Catalyst: INQUIRY FOR CHANGE

vol.1 no.2 ■ March 2001

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL MISSION, SERVICE, AND SERVICE-LEARNING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN NEW YORK STATE

Esther Prins, Graduate Research Assistant
The Institute for Community College Development, Cornell University[1]

The Institute for Community College Development (ICCD) conducted a survey of the 36 community colleges in the SUNY and CUNY systems to learn to what extent community colleges in New York State use and support course-based service-learning. More broadly, the study examined the relationship between community colleges' institutional mission, service, and service-learning. Service-learning is a teaching method that engages students in community service as a part of academic course work. It involves reflection on community service and is responsive to community needs.

Chief academic or student affairs officers from 24 colleges (67%) responded to the survey. Using survey data and analysis of mission statements, the study achieved three purposes:

- how community colleges perceive their mission and are involved in their communities;
- major barriers to and reasons for engaging in service-learning; *and*
- descriptive information about service-learning initiatives, including the level of institutional support.

Affirming the positive ways that community colleges already contribute to their communities, this study suggests that by becoming more civically engaged through initiatives such as service-learning, community colleges and their students can become leaders in solving public problems with community partners. The research brief presents the key findings and raises questions for reflection.

[1] ICCD wishes to thank the American Association of Community Colleges and Campus Compact for the use of some of their service-learning survey items, as well as their useful definitions of service-learning. Campus Compact's "service-learning pyramid" informed the questions about support for service-learning.

The Institute for Community College Development at Cornell is committed to providing high quality and timely research to community colleges. Research projects are stakeholder driven for the purpose of researching areas of the most interest to community colleges and their peer institutions in terms of social, economic, and policy considerations for bringing about change. The *Catalyst* is the very first publication of research projects conducted by the Institute to fulfill its research objectives. As the Institute's research program grows, the *Catalyst* will be disseminated to community college presidents, senior administrators in institutional research, student development, business, academic affairs, and faculty. Project summaries can also be accessed on ICCD's website: http//www.iccd.cornell.edu

This research project was supported by the Institute for Community College Development at Cornell under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Grigoriu, Cornell University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Area	N	%
Rural	12	50%
Suburban	5	21%
Urban	7	29%

System	N	%
SUNY	19	79%
CUNY	5	21%

Enrollment	N	%
≤2,000	4	17%
2,001-5,000	10	42%
5,001-10,000	5	21%
10,001-15,000	4	17%
15,001-20,000	1	4%

Institutional Characteristics

The majority of respondents were from rural, SUNY community colleges with fewer than 5,000 students.

Community Colleges' Mission and Purpose

Sixteen colleges (67%) indicated that service was part of their mission. However, there were discrepancies between survey responses and mission statements. Some respondents checked "no," but their college's mission statement *did* include service—either explicitly or implicitly. Other respondents checked "yes" although their college did not include service in the mission statement. These findings underscore the importance of aligning mission and service and suggest that at some colleges, a gap exists between the mission—as articulated and understood—and practice. This disconnect may reflect different definitions of service and/or institutional confusion about the role of service, which could hinder the success of service-learning and other forms of service (cf. Holland, 1997).

Community colleges viewed academic (**A**), economic (**E**), and civic (**C**) concerns as part of their primary purpose, but the civic mission was relatively less important. Respondents from colleges that offer service-learning viewed academics as their primary purpose, but perceived civic purposes as more important than economic ones.

Survey item:

Our community college's primary purpose is to:	Mean[2]	SD
Help students to realize their individual goals (**A**)	1.08	.28
Develop students' capacity to think and act critically (**A**)	1.08	.28
Give students better opportunities in life (**A**)	1.13	.34
Provide quality postsecondary and continuing education opportunities (**A**)	1.21	.41
Prepare students to transfer to 4-year programs (**A**)	1.25	.53
Prepare students to find employment (**E**)	1.29	.46
Improve the quality of life in our community (**C**)	1.29	.46
Enable students to become active citizens (**C**)	1.33	.48
Promote economic and workforce development (**E**)	1.38	.49
Serve the needs of local business and industry (**E**)	1.42	.50
Help to create a more democratic community (**C**)	1.63	.71

Eyler and Giles (1999) argue that "democracy, education, and citizenship are inseparable" (154). Other advocates of a democratic approach to education, such as Barber and Battistoni (1993), Lisman (1998), Boyte (1999), and Ehrlich (1997), concur. However, this study suggests that community colleges affirmed some aspects of a civic mission, such as improving the quality of life in their community, but as a whole, this mission was less important and less explicitly articulated than the academic and economic missions. Education was linked primarily to students' personal achievement, life opportunities, and socio-economic advancement and secondarily to citizenship. This indicates that, with some very noteworthy exceptions, the colleges in this study do not view democracy, education, and citizenship as "inseparable."

What could community colleges, communities, and students gain from adopting a civic orientation that views education and work as a way to prepare students for active citizenship? What would happen if community colleges saw *all* of their work as a way to solve public problems and contribute to their community's well-being? How would service-learning fit into and contribute to this civic orientation?

[2] Unless otherwise noted, all means refer to a five-point Likert scale where 1=*strongly agree* and 5=*strongly disagree*.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Forms of Service

Community colleges supported many kinds of service initiatives in their communities, such as hosting public events, providing meeting space for community groups, workshops on public issues, and professional development for businesses, partnerships with community-based organizations, and non-credit community service programs. Colleges tended to engage in services that required less institutional commitment and support, such as offering space.[3] Community colleges that included service in their mission *and* offered service-learning were engaged in significantly more services, especially those that met most of the following criteria: 1) require the *ongoing* investment of institutional resources, 2) integrate many areas of the college, 3) are relatively permanent, 4) seek to understand and address root causes of community problems, and 5) involve community partners in a reciprocal relationship.

Some community colleges have moved toward this vision of partnering with local organizations to create healthier communities and prepare students for a lifetime of community involvement. For others, "service" means charitable, *ad hoc* involvement, not a dynamic partnership intended to solve community problems collectively.

These forms of service raise the following questions: How can community colleges move toward a strategic vision for community renewal that involves reciprocal college-community relationships and sustained commitment of resources, integrates a wide variety of disciplines, and addresses the root causes of community problems? How would this strategic vision transform college-community relationships? What additional challenges would this vision present?

Barriers

"It's not an institutional priority" was a key barrier to offering service-learning and "lack of top level/presidential support" was the least important. Other reasons, in order of importance, were: 2) lack of student time and interest, 3) insufficient knowledge, 4) lack of faculty interest and time, 5) too much administration, and 6) insufficient budget flexibility and financial resources.

Other studies show that the survival and success of service-learning requires senior administrators' support (Holland, 1997; Serow, et al., 1996a and 1996b; Ward, 1996). Thus, the gap between "institutional priority" and "top-level support" raises several questions. How do community colleges set institutional priorities? To what extent are top level administrators and CEOs responsible for setting and communicating them? How could community colleges foster dialogue on their campuses about the relationship between their institutional priorities and service?

Reasons for Engaging in Service-Learning

Colleges offered service-learning chiefly for academic reasons, followed by community-based concerns, such as strengthening college-community relations. Pragmatic and externally-driven reasons (e.g., enhancing the college's image or following a trend in higher education) were less important. Career preparation was the primary reason for engaging in service-learning. There was a strong, positive relationship between the economic mission of the community college and academic reasons for doing service-learning.

The colleges in this study perceive service-learning first as a way to enrich students academically and professionally and secondarily as a means of civic engagement. The multiple reasons for offering service-learning show that "service-learning can be part of both the educational and service missions of community colleges" (Serow, 1996:11). Considerations include: what is the promise of viewing service-learning as a way to prepare students to be citizens in *all* aspects of their lives, including their vocation? How could service-learning transform students' understanding of what work means and how it relates to being a citizen?

Description of Service-Learning Programs[4]

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents use service-learning and eight percent are developing programs. In terms of faculty usage, service-learning is at an introductory level in all but one college (i.e., <10% of faculty use service-learning). The number of students taking service-learning courses varied considerably, from one to 20 to more than 100. Forty-four percent of colleges offered five or fewer service-learning courses, primarily in the disciplines of social science (78%), vocational-technical (56%), and business (44%). Colleges formed most service-learning partnerships with private non-profits (78%), government agencies (78%), and schools (67%), and most often addressed educational (67%), human services (67%), health (56%), and community/economic development issues (44%).

Colleges administer service-learning differently, often with several forms

[3] For analysis, service initiatives were arranged into four levels according to the amount of institutional support and commitment that they require. The following criteria were used to categorize services: reciprocity, resources, permanence, integration, and depth of change. For example, community development initiatives (Level 4) are typically comprehensive, sustained efforts aimed at solving public problems with community partners. Providing meeting space (Level 1) is a more temporary, *ad hoc* activity that requires little reciprocity or permanent support, etc.

[4] These data refer to the 1999-2000 academic year. Only the nine respondents whose community colleges offer SL responded to the questions in this section.

of administration. The most common forms of administration are different faculty members in different disciplines (56%), academic affairs (44%), or student affairs (33%). No college had a volunteer coordinator or service-learning officer, coordinator, or team. The perceived quality of service-learning programs is "average" to "fair." The quality is significantly higher at colleges with more institutional support for service-learning than at those with less support.

Institutional Support

Community colleges were "supportive" to "neutral" toward service-learning. According to the survey items derived from Campus Compact's "service-learning pyramid," six colleges were at an introductory level of institutionalization, three were intermediate, and none were advanced. At an introductory level, service-learning is primarily an *ad hoc* and personality-driven activity; only a few faculty use it in their classes and few rewards or supports exist for engaging in service-learning. At higher levels, service-learning is more widespread and supported. Support was significantly higher at colleges with more than 5,000 enrolled students.

Respondents agreed most strongly with the following items: "we have developed some community networks" (intermediate level); "service-learning and other practices of engagement are aligned with the institutional mission" (advanced); and "campus has strategic reciprocal community partnerships supported by the president and other administrators." Respondents disagreed most strongly with the statements, "service-learning is a widespread and valued practice across all disciplines" and "there is permanent funding for service-learning."

These findings indicate that community colleges have built relationships with community institutions and service-learning is aligned with their institutional mission. Linking service-learning to an institution's mission "may be the most critical variable for institutionalizing service-learning" (Hudson & Trudeau, 1995, quoted in Holland, 1997, p. 35). However, because other types of support for service-learning are weaker, the community colleges in this study have not yet developed a comprehensive system to initiate and strengthen service-learning endeavors. How might community colleges support service-learning more fully? What external and internal resources do they need to do so? What are the dangers of institutionalizing service-learning and how can they be mitigated?

The level of support for service-learning and community colleges' economic mission are closely related (r=85, p<.01). Since many colleges tend to focus on workforce development and vocational education, they might view service-learning as a way to achieve these goals. The survey data support this hypothesis: a high percentage of colleges offer service-learning in vocational-technical (56%) and business (44%) courses, nearly half have a for-profit service-learning partner, and there was a strong, positive relationship between colleges' *economic mission* and *academic reasons* for engaging in service-learning—especially career preparation. If service-learning is perceived as a way to combine concerns about economics and employment with academic and career preparation, then community colleges seem more likely to support it. Further exploration includes exploring how are colleges' academic, economic, and civic missions interrelated? Could service-learning help people integrate and reflect critically on the relationship between these concerns?

Conclusion

Because community colleges have established relationships with community groups and are involved in their communities in diverse ways, they have a strong basis upon which to develop and strengthen service-learning initiatives and other practices of civic engagement. In this way, community colleges and their students can work with community partners to create communities in which people want to live. As the conversation about service-learning and civic engagement continues, we can expect more community colleges to re-position their roles in their communities and re-evaluate the ways in which they and their students work with others to solve public problems.

To follow up on the study of service-learning at community colleges in New York state, further study is underway to conduct in-depth interviews with ten to twelve community college faculty who use service-learning in their courses. Interviews will explore issues such as faculty members' experiences in doing service-learning, the challenges and surprises they have encountered, which approach to service-learning they espouse, and their opinions on the institutionalization of service-learning. These practitioner profiles will generate valuable insights into the practice of service-learning at community colleges, highlighting both the tensions and promises that arise as community colleges become more civically engaged.

Selected Bibliography

Barber, B. R. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barber, B. R., & Battistoni, R. (1993). A Season of Service: Introducing Service Learning into the Liberal Arts Curriculum. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 26, 235-240, 262.

Barnett, L. (1996). Service-Learning: Why Community Colleges. In M. H. Parsons & C. D. Lisman (Eds.), *Promoting Community Renewal through Civic Literacy and Service Learning* (pp. 7-15). New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 93. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Boyte, H. C. (1999). Off the Playground of Civil Society. *PEGS: The Good Society*, 9(2), 1, 4-7.

Campus Compact. (1996). *Creating a climate for change: Lessons learned from the 1991-1996 Institutes on integrating service with academic study. A Report of the Project on Integrating Service with Academic Study*. Providence: Campus Compact.

Ehrlich, T. (1997). Civic Learning: Democracy and Education Revisited. *The Educational Record*, 78(3-4), 56-65.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30-41.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the Service of What? The Politics of Service Learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(9), 592-99.

Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a Civil Society: Civic Literacy and Service Learning*. Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey.

Morton, K. (1995). The Irony of Service: Charity, Project, and Social Change in Service-Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 19-32.

Parsons, M. H., & Lisman, C. D. (Eds.). (1996). *Promoting Community Renewal through Civic Literacy and Service Learning*. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 93. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). *Community Service and Higher Learning: Explorations of the Caring Self*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Robinson, G. (1999). Stepping Into Our Destiny. *Community College Journal*, 70(3), 8-12.

Robinson, G., & Barnett, L. (1996). *Service Learning and Community Colleges: Where We Are*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Serow, R. C., Calleson, D. C., Parker, L. G., & Morgan, L. (1996a). Institutional Support for Service-Learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(4), 220-225.

Serow, R. C., Calleson, D. C., & Parker, L. G. (1996b). Service Learning and the Institutional Mission of Community Colleges. *Community College Review*, 23(4), 3-13.

Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E. J., & Cruz , N. I. (1999). *Service-learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, P, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, K. (1996). Service-Learning and Student Volunteerism: Reflections on Institutional Commitment. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 55-65.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (1999). Service Learning as Democratic Action. *Educational Horizons*, 77(4), 186-93.

Online Resources

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) Service Learning Clearinghouse (http://www.aacc.nche.edu/initiatives/horizons/slch.htm)
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education(http://www.aacte.org/otherpro.html)
American Association for Higher Education (http://www.aahe.org/service/srv-lrn.htm)
American Political Science Association (APSA) (http://www.apsanet.org/teach/service/)
Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges (http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/academic/compact/)
Center for Civic Education (http://www.civiced.org/)
Communications for a Sustainable Future Guide to Service-Learning (http://csf.colorado.edu/sl/)
Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL) (http://www.cool2serve.org/)
Corporation for National Service (http://www.cns.gov/)
Learn and Serve (http://www.cns.gov/learn/index.html)
Council of Independent Colleges (http://www.cic.edu/projects/)
ImpactOnline (http://www.impactonline.org/)
International Partnership for Service-Learning (http://www.ipsl.org/)
The Invisible College (http://www.selu.edu/orgs/ic/index.htm)
Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning (http://www.umich.edu/~ocsl/MJCSL/)
National Campus Compact (http://www.compact.org)
"Building the Pyramid of Service-Learning" (http://www.compact.org/awards/PEW.html)
National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (http://nicsl.jaws.umn.edu/)
National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE) (http://www.nsee.org/)
National Youth Leadership Council (http://www.nylc.org/)
Rural Clearinghouse for Lifelong Education & Development (http://www-personal.ksu.edu/~rcled/)
UCLA Service-Learning Clearinghouse Project (http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/slc/)

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

School of Industrial & Labor Relations
Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4203
www.iccd.cornell.edu

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Catalyst: INQUIRY FOR CHANGE

vol.1 no.3 ■ March 2001

DECISION-MAKING FOR PARTNERSHIP ENGAGEMENT BY SUNY COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Esther Prins and Nancy Franz[1]
The Institute for Community College Development, Cornell University

Introduction

The reduction of public funding and a movement towards increased accountability has required community college presidents to explore new partnerships. These partnerships with institutions such as businesses and industries, community organizations, and/or educational institutions may be fiscally driven, educationally motivated, or a political reality. Studies in the community college literature document numerous partnerships and a wide array of purposes, but few studies deeply examine the criteria community college presidents use to make decisions about engaging in partnership agreements.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the following issues:
1) the criteria community college presidents use when engaging in a partnership with others institutions, 2) the ways in which presidents make decisions relating to partnerships, and 3) what presidents think would enhance their decision-making ability. For the purpose of this study, partnerships were defined as agreements that include mutual exchange, access to external funds not usually available independently, delineation of roles and responsibilities through a contract and a commitment to work together to resolve conflicts in socially acceptable ways (Cantor, 1995).

This study found that when presidents decide whether or not to engage in a partnership, they use criteria primarily related to financial and human resources, costs and benefits, and institutional mission. In addition, bureaucracy and politics can deter them from forming partnerships. Changes in politics, additional resources and tools, and the identification of successful partnerships would enhance their decision-making. Presidents reiterated that partnerships are essential to community colleges' future.

Theoretical Framework

According to Forester (1989), planners guide future action. Community college presidents, then, are also planners. Rational choice theories assume that administrators have flawless information, unlimited time, and a well-defined problem and can thoroughly examine all of the alternatives before making a decision (Forester 1989). However, bounded

The Institute for Community College Development at Cornell is committed to providing high quality and timely research to community colleges. Research projects are stakeholder driven for the purpose of researching areas of the most interest to community colleges and their peer institutions in terms of social, economic, and policy considerations for bringing about change. The *Catalyst* is the very first publication of research projects conducted by the Institute to fulfill its research objectives. As the Institute's research program grows, the *Catalyst* will be disseminated to community college presidents, senior administrators in institutional research, student development, business, academic affairs, and faculty. Project summaries can also be accessed on ICCD's website: http//www.iccd.cornell.edu

This research project was supported by the Institute for Community College Development at Cornell under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Grigoriu, Cornell University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rationality means that constraints such as lack of resources, knowledge, time, and limited information prevent administrators from making optimum decisions. Political-economic inequality also shapes the situations in which planners (and presidents) work (Forester 1989). Decision-making, then, is both technical and political, for planners selectively organize attention "to real possibilities of action"(14). Community college presidents not only satisfice, network, and bargain, but as Forester argues, should also make decisions that minimize inequality and promote democratic ends.

Ehrlich (1997) defines civic engagement as "believing that you can and should make a difference in enhancing your community.... It means possessing the combination of knowledge, skills, and values necessary to help make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through political and non-political processes" (56). The engaged institution is responsive and accessible, respects partner needs, and integrates research and teaching. The success of engagement comes from strong partnerships with government, business, and non-profit organizations (Kellogg Commission, 1999). These institutions are seen as more responsive to stakeholder needs than many institutions that do not value the community as a partner in higher education.

Methods

A brief, open-ended e-mail survey was sent to thirty-one SUNY community college presidents. Sixteen presidents (52%) returned usable surveys. The surveys were analyzed to identify themes and patterns in decision-making about partnerships. This analysis revealed which criteria presidents use when they decide whether or not to engage in partnerships, which leadership models they prefer, and considerations that could strengthen partnership-building.

Findings and Discussion

Reasons for Engaging in Partnerships

When deciding whether or not to engage in a given partnership, SUNY community college presidents rely most often on the following criteria: resources and costs, college mission match, community benefit, benefits to the college and benefits to students. Presidents consider the costs to the college (financial and human resources) and taxpayers and the financial soundness of the proposed partnership. Partnerships must be consistent with and help accomplish the college mission. Benefits to the community might include economic and community development. Benefits to the college could entail increased enrollment and funding sources or more articulation possibilities for grants. Lastly, benefits to students could include enhancing academic programs and students' present and future education, improving job placement, and providing more experiences. Presidents also used criteria such as mutual benefits, the quality of the partner, the benefit for faculty, and the level of trust.

Reasons for Not Engaging in Partnerships

When asked what prevents them from participating in a partnership, community college presidents identified the following criteria as most important: resources, non-mutual gain, politics, and mission mismatch. The amount of human and financial resources that partnerships require may be too great or a partnership may not offer mutual benefits for all parties. Politics, bureaucracy, or potentially negative political consequences may hinder presidents from pursuing partnerships. Finally, the proposed partnership may be inconsistent with the college's mission. Lack of trust, the partner's reputation, poor communication, lack of partners, parochialism, union contracts, and ethical issues also prevented presidents from engaging in partnerships.

Presidents consider a constellation of factors when they decide whether or not to engage in partnerships; no single reason determines their decisions. Resources/costs and consistency with the community college mission are two of the most important criteria that they use. However, politics and bureaucracy at the state, regional, and local levels shape which partnerships presidents decide to pursue and/or may discourage them from engaging in partnerships at all. According to Forester's (1989) planning theory, this set of constraints requires that presidents negotiate among competing interests, exercise practical judgment, and analyze how political relationships affect their options and decisions. Paradoxically, by becoming more aware of the political constraints, presidents can make wiser, more informed decisions. As they become more engaged in their communities, community colleges will interact with an increasingly complex array of institutional actors.

Preferred Leadership Models

When making decisions related to partnerships, community college presidents indicate that they prefer consultative and participative leadership models (Block, 1993) rather than an authoritative leadership model. Other types of leadership were mixed or unclear. The first type of leader consults key people such as administrators before making a decision. The following comments reflect this approach: "Getting joint teams at appropriate levels to discuss details and make recommendations;" "Decisions are made in cooperation with the Vice Presidents and then are presented the Board of Trustees in

sub-committee meetings." By contrast, participative leaders actively involve stakeholders in the decision-making process. The following comments illustrate this model: "By committee consensus with administrators and faculty participating;" "My practice is to involve other key figures in the College (including those who are likely to be affected, those who have expertise in the area, and those who will have to implement the decision) in assessing the value of the partnership, meeting with the prospective partner's team of similar individuals, and implementing the actions and activities of the project(s)." Finally, an authoritative leader makes a decision without consulting or involving key stakeholders. Faculty, staff, administrators, and board members were most frequently involved in making decisions about partnerships with the president.

When making decisions about partnerships, presidents were more likely to consult key people than to include many people in a participatory decision-making process. Is the consultative style the best that can be attained in a large, bureaucratic system? Is true participation even possible in a complex educational system such as SUNY? Given the constraints (and opportunities) of this system, how can presidents effectively address concerns about who participates in making decisions and whose voices are heard (cf. Forester 1989)?

Enhanced Decision-Making about Partnerships

SUNY community college presidents indicated that changes in politics, additional resources and tools, and the identification of successful partnerships would enhance their ability to make partnership decisions. Presidents desired "increased autonomy from the county and government operations" and felt that bureaucracy hindered partnerships. For instance, one president stated:

There is an undue bureaucratic labyrinth that we must negotiate, within and through state agencies, in order to execute a partnership ...unless they are partnerships in the areas of training or non-credit programs....We have felt there is an air of elitism and/or protectionism on the part of the four-year institutions when we have ever broached partnership ideas that involve our college granting, or being a part of the granting of, a baccalaureate degree in certain academic programs that we believe would be very beneficial to the system as a whole. We'd like the SUNY system to operate as a true, mutually reinforcing system.

Presidents suggested that New York State and individual counties should dedicate more resources to help community colleges develop community partnerships. One president explained which factors limit their creativity in forming partnerships:

As a community college in the State University of New York system...we have felt that community colleges...have not been as equitably treated in terms of "resource allocation." We feel we have less opportunity to keep and manage income we generate. Hence, we feel a good deal of pressure to identify sources of "unrestricted" operating funds in order to finance innovative programs. This pressure, in turn, limits how expansive our creativity can be with potential partners—either from the educational or business arenas.

Presidents indicated that identifying successful community college partnerships would help others "be more willing to take the extra step to even propose a partnership idea." Lastly, they suggested that tools such as a "comprehensive inventory of regional agencies" and "a best practices list of partnerships" would be helpful. Presidents' comments reveal that in addition to more resources, they want changes in political structures. Politics are pervasive and inevitable. What kinds of systemic or policy changes would encourage community colleges to form creative, dynamic partnerships? How can SUNY best operate as a "true, mutually reinforcing system"?

Partnerships are Essential

Community college presidents also indicated that partnerships are "a critical aspect of what colleges do," "essential to the future of community colleges," and "a necessity if we are going to reach our potential." One president noted, "As a rule, community colleges have a good history of creating and engaging in partnerships with a wide variety of institutions and agencies. Given the types of institutions we are and the common mission we have, partnerships are a 'natural' for us." Another president suggested, "It would be very effective for us to have a two-day symposium that highlights successful partnerships that are currently in existence at community colleges in New York State, or for that matter, any state. Models presented by each region would be useful and would stir more creativity on the part of the campuses."

Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

This study creates greater awareness of SUNY community college presidents' decision-making and leadership patterns relating to partnerships. Presidents prefer to use a consultative leadership model when making partnership decisions. Future research could examine to what extent participative decision-making is possible in a complex

system such as SUNY. Presidents believe that partnerships are critical to community colleges' future, yet they feel limited by budget restrictions and political constraints. This study suggests that by providing additional resources, state/local government and SUNY could encourage community colleges to form partnerships.

Future research could examine the following questions: Which practices characterize successful SUNY community college partnerships? How do other stakeholders perceive and respond to the model(s) presidents use to make decisions about partnerships? Which approach(es) do stakeholders prefer? What is the leadership style of presidents at colleges that successfully engage in partnerships?

References

Block, P. 1993. *Stewardship: Choosing Success Over Self-Interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cantor, J. 1995. "Apprenticeships Link Community-Technical Colleges and Business and Industry for Workforce Training." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 19(1):47-71.

Ehrlich, T. 1997. Civic Learning: Democracy and Education Revisited. *The Educational Record*, 78(3-4), 56-65.

Forester, J. 1989. *Planning in the Face of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. "Returning to our Roots: The Engaged University," Third Report of the Commission. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan.

[1] Nancy Franz, a doctoral student in Extension and Adult Education at Cornell University, conducted this research and analyzed the findings. Esther Prins, a Graduate Research Assistant with ICCD, was primarily responsible for writing the research brief.

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

School of Industrial & Labor Relations
Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4203
www.iccd.cornell.edu

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Catalyst: INQUIRY FOR CHANGE

vol.1 no.4 ■ March 2001

CONNECTING THE CLASSROOM TO THE COMMUNITY: COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROFESSORS' EXPERIENCES IN SERVICE LEARNING

A report provided by the Institute for Community College Development
Prepared by Esther Prins, Graduate Research Assistant

Based on in-depth interviews with seven faculty members at four community colleges in upstate New York, this study explores what professors have learned about the successful practice of service-learning. Service-learning integrates community service with academic course work, involves reflection on service, and responds to community needs. By analyzing faculty experiences with service-learning, this research builds on and extends the survey ICCD conducted in 2000 (see *Catalyst*, March 2001).

This study has two main purposes:

1) **to draw insights from the practice of community college educators who use service-learning; and**

2) **to strengthen service-learning and other practices of civic engagement at community colleges in New York state and other regions.**

Faculty and Service-Learning Projects

The professors who participated in the study have an average of 20 years teaching experience and have used service-learning for five to eight years, although they may not have used the term when they began utilizing the concept of service-learning.[1] Their service-learning projects vary widely, which indicates that there is no single way to do service-learning (see Table 1). Faculty from diverse disciplines use it for distinct purposes.

- *Donna Nielsen* is a Nursing professor at Tompkins-Cortland Community College in Dryden, near Ithaca, NY. When she visited Haiti during college, she dreamed of taking students to Nicaragua. For six years, over the three-week January break, she and a political science colleague have brought students to Puerto Cabezas, Nicaragua. Students worked in local health clinics, completed independent projects, learned about community organizations, such as churches and women's groups, and study culture, politics, and language. Students earned three credits each for International Health, Spanish Language and Culture of Nicaragua.

- *Ben Kasper*, a professor of Political Science at Broome Community College in Binghamton, NY is primarily interested in civic education. In his internship course, students work six to nine hours a week at a community agency. Students discuss their experiences in the class component, write a book review, and keep a log or journal of their experiences. The Public Policy course is currently being revised to include a required service-learning component. The AACC (American Association of Community Colleges) recently funded Broome's proposal for the Horizons Project, which will help the college expand its service-learning program to include new community partners such as schools.

The Institute for Community College Development at Cornell is committed to providing high quality and timely research to community colleges. Research projects are stakeholder-driven for the purpose of researching areas of the most interest to community colleges and their peer institutions in terms of social, economic, and policy considerations for bringing about change. The *Catalyst* is the very first publication of research projects conducted by the Institute to fulfill its research objectives. As the institute's research program grows, the *Catalyst* will be disseminated to community college presidents, senior administrators in institutional research, student development, business, academic affairs, and faculty. Project summaries can also be accessed on ICCD's website: http//www.iccd.cornell.edu

This research project was supported by the Institute for Community College Development at Cornell under the supervision of Dr. Elizabeth Grigoriu, Cornell University.

- *Nina Tamrowski* is a Political Science professor and an administrator in the student government office at Onondaga Community College (OCC) near Syracuse, NY. A student first introduced her to service-learning. To teach students about good citizenship, she uses service-learning in State and Local Politics, American Politics, and Women and Politics, either as a requirement or extra-credit option. Students volunteer in the community for eight to ten hours during the semester and write an essay about their experience, addressing issues regarding the role of social service agencies and government in society. Many students volunteer at organizations such as Habitat for Humanity, soup kitchens, and the Fire Department. Some work on environmental and other community issues.

- A playwright and former childhood educator and police officer, *Donna Stuccio* is a Criminal Justice professor at OCC. Because she believes that people who go into Criminal Justice careers should feel comfortable helping people in need, Donna requires that students in her introductory classes do eight hours of community service for the semester. Students generally find their own placements in community agencies such as homeless shelters, soup kitchens, schools, or Habitat for Humanity. Service such as donating platelets or serving as volunteer firefighters are also acceptable. Students are required to write a short paper on their experience at the end of the semester.

- *Doug Brown* is the professor who directs the Student Center at Monroe Community College (MCC) in Rochester. He helped bring AmeriCorps to Rochester and set up MCC's service-learning program. The Experiential Education Department funds the Community Service Learning (CSL) course, and the Student Center teaches it. It meets core requirements for departments such as History and Political Science, Communications, and Psychology. Students work 135 hours at not-for-profit community organizations and meet every two weeks for a reflective session. In the Leadership Development Seminar (LDS), which is affiliated with the Communications Department, student leaders provide services for the community, raise funds for community-based organizations, and receive personal development training. Through MCC's dual-credit program with seven area high schools, teachers use service-learning while students earn credit hours at MCC.

- *Gary Thompson* is the Chairman of MCC's Criminal Justice Department. Each semester, 30 to 40 Criminal Justice students at the downtown campus take a course for credit, volunteer 90 hours through the Rochester Police Department on community service activities, and attend weekly reflective sessions. In some instances, they walk downtown patrol and interact with programs such as community policing (PACTAC–Police and Citizens Together Against Crime) and Police Citizen Interaction Committees. Past initiatives have included jury diversification and school safety. A new program will allow students to mentor juveniles who are sent to drug court.

- According to *Ed Vesneske*, a Business professor at MCC, "The way I've connected my work with the needs in the community has usually been circumstantial in the sense that if I was involved in an outside activity, I would quite often find ways in which students could become involved." Rather than formally using service-learning, he gives students extra-credit or independent study opportunities to apply business concepts to community needs. For example, students have been involved in community events such as Rochester's tourist attraction, the Lilac Festival. One of these students was primarily instrumental in creating the largest fashion show in Rochester's history involving 62 stores and 72 models. Another student was responsible for starting the first Downtown Restaurant Association. Other students conducted surveys such as traffic flow in downtown Rochester. Students assisted a small group of citizens who convinced the Preservation Board and the City not to go forward with a scheduled demolition of a historic downtown building.

Table 1:
Features of service-learning projects

Faculty & College	Course requires service?	Who finds placement?	Related Assignments	Consistant, oral, group reflection?	Service related to curriculum?	Time Commitment
Ed MCC	No; extra credit or independent study	Professor presents opportunities	Depends on project	No	Yes	Depends on project
Donna OCC	Yes	Students	Short paper (2-3 pages)	No	Depends on project	8 hours per semester
Nina OCC	Course 1: Yes Courses 2 and 3: Extra Credit	Professor presents options & students arrange	Short paper (3-4 pages)	No	Usually	8-10 hours per semester
Ben BCC	Yes	Students	Book review; journal	Yes	Yes	6-9 hours per week internship
Donna TC3	Yes	Professor–some Nicaraguan communities	Health clinics; independent project; other	Yes	Yes	3 weeks over winter break
Gary MCC	Yes	Always with Police Dept.	Varies	Yes	Yes	90 hours per semester
Doug MCC	Yes; meets core requirments	Usually students	Varies	Yes	Yes	CSL: 135 hours per semester LDS: varies

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty use service-learning for a variety of reasons, mainly because of the powerful ways it benefits students. They believe that service-learning:

Is good pedagogy. It fosters greater learning and reflection because it is based on active, hands-on experiences outside the classroom. Service-learning makes education more "realistic" and "closer to home." Students are "actively *doing* something rather than just reading something." In reflective sessions, students also learn from each other and solve problems together. Service-learning "forces students to think about learning more than they *ever* do." Students cannot falsify service-learning assignments or get them off the Internet.

Promotes civic education, citizenship, and community participation. As one professor stated, "I sincerely believe that one of the primary objectives of higher education is to train people to be good citizens....Just taking a course in American history or Sociology or American Government is necessary but not sufficient. I think it's important for people to go out into the community to utilize the course material, the concepts, and the theories, and see some of the real needs in their own backyard...and then to think about the policies and solutions to those issues. Hopefully, in the process, people will become better citizens, more aware of the issues, and vote more frequently in a rational, informed, and intelligent way." Service-learning is also a "backdoor to a multicultural curriculum" because service experiences may challenge stereotypes (e.g., of homeless people).

Fosters student "empowerment." "Like the word education, it comes from the Latin 'educo'—to free, to lead out....I think more and more people feel that they are bowed to the mercy of others, and I think this is a matter of empowerment. I do my best to try to make that point—that they *can* have an effect on what happens."

Stimulates personal and social change. It can help students develop "social consciousness" and take a "leading role in trying to bring about social change." For example, the Nicaragua service-learning experience sparks "total directional changes in where students are going to work and what area they're going to focus on. It changes the quality of how they see everything and their values....To see people in need, to feel that, and to know that most of the world is in that situation...drives them

Sage Suggestions about Service-Learning for Faculty and Colleges

Based on their experiences in service-learning, professors shared their ideas about how to make it a rewarding experience for faculty, students, college, and community.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FACULTY

■ ***Follow your passion and interests.***

Rewarding service-learning projects grow out of professors' own "passion," "gifting," "uniqueness," involvement in their community, and life experiences. The service-learning opportunities described above emerged from professors' lifelong dreams and meaningful work as volunteers and as educators.

■ ***Develop your understanding.*** Faculty have to understand what service-learning is and is not (i.e., service divorced from learning, with little or no reflection). Organizations such as AACC and Campus Compact can help clarify what service-learning is and how to develop a successful program.

■ ***Find a partner.*** "Find somebody who would do it with you...Then talk about what you're trying to accomplish and how you can work together." Two faculty members could be in the same or different disciplines. The latter is useful for an interdisciplinary approach. Working with a partner can also help prevent burnout.

■ ***Take a sabbatical to prepare and set up the project.*** "Set up all your agencies....Only do it with one section. Make it manageable—30 students. Have in your head what you will accept for community service and what you won't. Establish your own ground rules and stick by your guns. Be prepared for some whining. You're going to read, for the most part, very positive responses" (Stuccio).

■ ***Use your creativity.*** Service-learning can help express and satisfy professors' creative side. "There's an incredible amount of creativity in crafting an assignment. And *that's really fun*, because you don't often get to think about how can you be creative in the classroom.... It's fun to create a new assignment and improve it as you experience the results" (Tamrowski). Like some professors in this study, you can use innovative teaching methods such as service-learning as a "tool for reappointment and promotion."

■ ***Try it! Don't give up!***

■ ***As the project develops, help students become more independent and autonomous.*** Service-learning is a developmental process for faculty *and* students. If appropriate, urge students to find their own placement. If the professor arranges the placement, they must support the students but "not *too* much. Don't do everything for them." Learn to let go and let students struggle with the dissonance. As faculty grow more comfortable with the project, they are more able to back off.

Donna Nielsen gives this advice to faculty:

"Whatever is your passion, whatever is your gifting, whatever is your uniqueness, go ahead and use that. That is going to be of great benefit to students. Find somebody who would do it with you. Then talk about what you're trying to accomplish and how you can work together in it....Get that going and then try it. I think everyone's going to have to go through that process. You can't skip to step three. You're going to start with doing it the first year. It's going to be a little stilted. You're going to be a little uncomfortable. You're going to start to learn the networks—whether they're local or international. But just do it. Don't be afraid of it. When you're giving and you're working in your creative area, you are going to be giving tremendous things to the students."

KEY COMPONENTS

■ ***Faculty have to see the value of service-learning and want to do it.*** They cannot be forced into it. Enlisting faculty support is essential because they are the ones "who have to do this. It's the faculty who have to embrace it and who have to believe in it.

to want to make a positive contribution instead of just being the recipients.... Even if they stay in this culture, they don't think the same way. They're not quite the same people."

Enhances career exploration and development. Service-learning can help students "see a different kind of job description" (i.e., connect their career to service), cultivate "leadership qualities" and "personal development skills," explore whether a specific career is a good fit, and reveal possibilities that students may not have otherwise considered.

Provides a sense of accomplishment. Students learn to persevere in challenging situations. "Encouraging them to try their wings in many avenues is incredibly powerful because they come out feeling very successful. They feel like they've done things they *never* dreamed they could.

Benefits the community college. Service-learning students help the college by being "ambassadors" to the community.

Can "make a difference" in communities. By working with and through local organizations, service-learning initiatives at these colleges have helped improve public safety, health, and economic vitality in rural, urban, and international communities. Enduring service-learning partnerships can be important to communities. For instance, because the TC3 group returns to Nicaragua every year, they have become "a relatively important part of this community. They count on us. We've gotten respect. They know that we're not just a one-time visit. We return."

Enhances teacher-student relationships. One professor was surprised to learn how students already volunteer in their communities. "I wouldn't know that unless I talked about service and had it as part of the class. I get to know more about who they are....With service-learning, I have so much more to say *back* to them. It really does open up a channel of communication, because you're really getting down to the nitty gritty of the world around them."

Is rewarding for teachers. "It's so satisfying as a faculty member to see how students survive difficult things, because it *is* difficult....It's very rewarding,....We all come out with a sense of accomplishment....What has been most rewarding is to witness the response of the people—that they are *so* thankful, so appreciative. It's also rewarding when we can make a difference." Service-learning also allows faculty to use their creativity.

The college can say all the warm and fuzzy things about service, but the bottom line is that it's the faculty who have to sell it in their classes." One professor suggested that colleges make information on service-learning available, whereas several others recommended promoting service-learning so that faculty see its benefits. Younger faculty may be more likely to adopt service-learning, because, as one professor noted, they tend to be more open to collaborative, non-traditional teaching methods.

■ ***Decide whether service-learning will be required or optional.*** Professors' views on this differed. Some believed that "you can't make people do community service." "Students have to want to do it" and should be rewarded in some way, such as extra credit. Since most community college students are over "over-extended" with work, family, school, and community reponsibilities, their "willingness, interest, and appreciation" are key. Professors who required service view it as a homework assignment and found that although students complained initially, they were ultimately grateful for the experience and learned from it things that they could only experience outside the classroom.

■ ***For service-learning to be meaningful, reflection is crucial.*** "At first I didn't realize how important that was. Oral and written reflection through journaling, essays, presentations, and group discussions fosters deep learning. If you don't have the reflective component, it's just community service." In service-learning projects, students may confront stereotypes, see the effects of poverty, and experience dissonance. Reflective sessions help them process and learn from the ideas, feelings, and reactions that service-learning evokes.

■ ***Connect service-learning to a real need in the community.*** "Don't go out and invent needs for community service....You've got to have a real need" (Thompson). Ideally, a community organization comes to the professor or college requesting help on a specific issue. Faculty should also "look at some community agencies and find out what some of the needs are in the community" (Kasper).

■ ***Link service-learning to an academic discipline and student learning.*** Service-learning should tie service and community needs to the educational mission. Consider how service-learning connects to your discipline and then structure the course so that it has a strong experiential *and* academic component. For instance, students in a biology course could do environmental work. Service-learning allows students to combine hands-on experience with academic discipline, and that makes learning come alive. It helps them "make the connection between what they want to do in their career and how that affects the community" (Thompson).

Ben Kasper highlights the importance of flexibility: *"People who offer service-learning are really frightened of the prospect that when you go into class the first day of the semester and you announce that there's going to be a service-learning component requiring students to go out into the community to go out and work—let's say three hours a week—that all of the students will stand up in their seats and head for the exit and walk out the door. There's a certain amount of resistance. You have to educate people and also be very, very flexible and creative in trying to find opportunities for students that are worthwhile and not burdensome. In some cases, I've allowed students to select what kind of service-learning they were willing to do. If it was at all reasonable I would say, "Sure, that's fine." So I think being accommodating and flexible is pretty important."*

■ ***Promote service-learning and "talk it up" to faculty, students, and administrators.*** Faculty can explain the service-learning concept to colleagues through faculty development workshops or newsletters and can encourage their students to spread the word to others. Presentations, one-on-one meetings,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and collaboration with the teaching and advising centers can also help administrators and faculty "get the word out there" about what faculty, students, the college, partner agencies, and the community gain from service-learning.

■ ***Assess the results.*** Assessment and evaluation reveal what effect this has on students both for the short-term and long-term, and what difference the program makes in the community. How did participation in service-learning affect students' career choices and preparation, political awareness and participation, learning, capacity for reflection, or community involvement? For instance, Donna Nielsen and her colleague used an epistemological scale. Her partner's dissertation explores how the Nicaragua program has shaped students.

Suggestions for Administration

■ ***Decide what the college mission is.*** The mission could focus on four-year transfer, job training, providing community service, or other purposes. One professor stated, "If the community college believes that it's an integral part of the community, that it's there to serve the community in a positive way, then the mission of the community college ought to be to promote and foster service-learning. This community college is primarily concerned with job training and vocational training, which is somewhat ironic because most of the students in this community college do not plan to stay [here]. They plan on leaving the community and in some cases, on leaving the state. So we're really not training or educating people to take jobs in the local community. That mission is obsolete. We really need to look at what the mission of the college really is." Service-learning can be "an important part of the mission of the institution" in terms of student learning and service.

■ ***From the top down, foster a "community-minded" attitude.*** A culture that "doesn't say 'No' to community groups" and encourages interaction with these organizations nurtures the development and growth of service-learning initiatives. As concepts such as service and community involvement become part of the "organizational thinking" or "framing" of the institution, "people will be more inclined to want to do these things for all kinds of reasons." When practices such as letting community agencies use college space or establishing partnerships are the norm, the college is more likely to support service-learning.

Less Support	More Support
■ Not a member of Campus Compact	■ Member of Campus Compact
■ Top administrators are neutral to negative toward service-learning	■ Top administrators champion service-learning
■ Little or no funding for service-learning	■ Funding available (e.g., service-learning)
■ Strategic plan doesn't recognize service and/or learning outside the classroom	■ Co-curricular and/or service-learning part of strategic plan
■ Students or faculty arrange own placements	■ College run office coordinates service-learning activities (e.g., place students in local organizations)
■ College allows faculty to do service-learning but provides little or no information about it	■ Administrators and faculty actively promote service-learning to faculty and students
■ Few or no resources, incentives, or release time	■ Faculty incentives or release time
■ Service-learning and other forms of service not rewarded in promotion and tenure	■ Service-learning and other forms of service rewarded in promotion and tenure
■ At one college, a student-run volunteer office used to coordinate service-learning placements for professors. However, "that structure started slipping....Then we would go to the effort of creating projects and students wouldn't sign up. We would be leaving agencies and the community hanging. We were burning bridges, which wasn't good. So the volunteer office had to stop promising anything....As the structure in that volunteer office deteriorated, so did the projects that the students in my classes were engaged in, because they were finding their own things. There was a time when I thought I'd better just stop doing this because I have students who are doing things without reflection and just putting in their time." Then the college moved volunteer services to career services, which "was a big move philosophically," and the faculty advisory committee was dissolved. "The support that exists for me now is essentially just that the Careers Office has a file drawer of volunteer opportunities."	■ This grant from AACC "was very, very helpful because it got us a lot of support and a lot of information about what service-learning was about, like curriculum development information. Different people from AACC came to our college and worked with us on developing what we needed to do. I'm not sure it would be a service-learning program had it not been for that." ■ "The college fully supported everything from day one—just support in letting you do things. From curriculum support to the deans & vice presidents saying, 'You can go to this conference.' Everybody's just 100% supportive. They have to be. From the top down it has to be. 'We're going to commit to it. If anybody wants to do this, we're going to make sure that it's available for the department to do.'" ■ This college just joined Campus Compact.[2] The President has to join, which "ensures commitment on the part of the institution—it's not just one segment of the institution."

Table 2: Continuum of Institutional support for service-learning

■ ***Allow your faculty to dream and do these things.*** Foster an environment where this can come forth, because that is going to be a tremendous gift from your college to the community." When you allow people "to express whatever their gift or passion is...it could be in things we've never even imagined yet. If you allow your faculty to be who they are, to dream dreams and connect with the community so that they're not just academia for academia's sake, it's a wonderful connection" (Nielson). Be open to new ideas. Encourage "crazy" ideas.

■ ***Support faculty.*** Administrators and department chairs can show commitment and endorsement of service-learning by allowing faculty to develop service-learning courses. Furthermore, they need to provide resources and incentives to learn and utilize new teaching methods such as service-learning, recognize community service in promotion and tenure, and give release time or credits to persue this activity. For this to happen, service must be "seen not as fringe, but as a true element of learning" (Vesneske). If administrators promote service-learning, they should speak language that faculty understand and recognize the pressures they face. At colleges where "anything that comes from the administration is not to be trusted," administrators should not "push [it] too much," but rather work with faculty-led groups (e.g., a teaching center) to promote and support service-learning.

■ ***Offer various kinds of support.*** Service-learning "needs to be institutionalized and supported from the administration" (Kasper). Professors identified many forms of support for service-learning initiatives (see Table 2), such as using AACC's resources, becoming a member of Campus Compact, applying for grants, making co-curricular and service-learning part of the strategic plan, promoting service-learning, and establishing a college-run office to place students in community organizations. This office or center can facilitate coordination with community agencies and relieve faculty from having to organize placements.

■ ***"Break down the walls" between student and academic services.*** Involve both academic and student services in developing and providing service-learning programs. At MCC, service-learning allowed student services and academic services to work together toward the college's educational mission by providing learning opportunities both in and outside the classroom. Service-learning can generate FTE credits for departments while enhancing students' personal and career development, benefiting community partners, and fostering innovation at the college.

[1] Academic and student affairs deans who responded to the 2000 survey provided the names of faculty at their institutions who use service-learning. Colleagues introduced me to two of these professors. I was unable to contact faculty at the five other community colleges in New York State that indicated they use service-learning. Interviews consisted of open-ended questions exploring what faculty have learned through their experiences in service-learning. From the transcribed interviews, I created a "practitioner profile"—i.e., the professor's story of his/her service-learning practice, told in his/her own voice—and sent them to interviewees for their review. Interviewees edited and revised the profiles and returned them to me with their permission to use them for this and other publications.

[2] Campus Compact is a coalition of college and university presidents whose primary purpose is to support campus-based public and community service, and whose mission is to help students develop the values and skills of citizenship through participation in public and community service.

References & Resources

Bringle, R. & J. Hatcher. 2000. "Institutionalization of Service Learning in Higher Education." *The Journal of Higher Education* 71(3):273-290.

Eyler, J., & D.E. Giles, Jr. 1999. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Holland, B. 1997. "Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service: A Model of Key Organizational Factors." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 4:30-41.

Schuh, J., & E. Whitt, Eds. 1999. *Creating Successful Partnerships between Academic and Student Affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Serow, R. C., & D. C. Calleson & L. G. Parker. 1996b. "Service-Learning and the Institutional Mission of Community Colleges." *Community College Review* 23(4):3-13.

Stanton, T. K., & D. E. J. Giles & N. I. Cruz. 1999. *Service-Learning: A Movement's Pioneers Reflect on Its Origins, Past, and Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Zlotkowski, E., Series Editor. 2000. *AAHE Series on Service-Learning in the Disciplines*. http://www.aahe.org/service/series_new.htm. (monographs on S-L in Composition, Communication Studies, Spanish, Political Science, Environmental Studies, Biology, Teacher Education, Medical Education, Engineering, Accounting, Peace Studies, History, Nursing, Sociology, Management, Psychology, Philosophy, & Women's Studies)

INSTITUTE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEVELOPMENT
A SUNY/CORNELL UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

School of Industrial & Labor Relations
Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4203
www.iccd.cornell.edu

CORNELL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

~~(Blanket)~~ Specific

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

All Publications: Catalyst Series Vol. 1, No. 1 — Vol. 1 No 4 + Vol. 2 No. 1	
Series (Identify Series):	
Division/Department Publications (Specify):	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

?

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

2A

Level 2A

?

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

Barbara A. Vinier
Executive Director

2B

Level 2B

?

☑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Barbara A Vinier	Printed Name/Position/Title: Barbara A. Vinier, Executive Director
Organization/Address: Institute for Community College Development 393B Ives Hall Cornell University Ithaca NY 14853	Telephone: 607 255 9259 FAX: 607 254 1520
	E-Mail Address: bav2@cornell.edu Date: 8/20/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provice the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Nicole Seymour, Acquisitions
ERIC/JC UCLA
3051 Moore Hall
P.O. Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521